

Double Patenting

The double patenting rejections relating to U.S. Patent No.'s 6,239,058, 6,166,153, 5,968,864, and 6,432,860 are proposed to be overcome by pointing out the following differences:

- 6,239,058 The catalyst of this patent is dried, as disclosed at column 5, line 10 and claim 1, column 12, line 12. It does not teach the benefits of low temperature synthesis and of the benefits of elimination of the drying step. It also does not teach the percentage of impregnation of the internal pore volume of the support.
- 6,166,153 This patent does not teach the benefits of low temperature synthesis and of the benefits of elimination of the drying step. It also does not teach the percentage of impregnation of the internal pore volume of the support.
- 5,968,864 The catalyst of this patent can be dried, as disclosed at column 5, line 15 and claim 1, column 11, line 6. This patent does teach the benefits of low temperature synthesis, but does not teach the benefits of elimination of the drying step. It also does not teach the percentage of impregnation of the internal pore volume of the support.
- 6,432,860 This patent does not teach the benefits of low temperature synthesis and of the benefits of elimination of the drying step.

It is believed that the above amendments place the application in condition for allowance.

Bradley Misley

Patent Attorney

ATOFINA Petrochemicals, Inc.

281-227-5370

email: [bradley.misley@atofina.com](mailto:bradley.misley@atofina.com)